arXiv:1607.04332v1 [cs.LO] 14 Jul 2016

CONVEXITY AND ORDER IN PROBABILISTIC CALL-BY-NAME FPC

MATHYS RENNELA

Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
e-mail address: mathysr@cs.ru.nl

Abstract. In the present paper, Kegelspitzen, which can be seen dcpos associated with a compatible convex structure, will be shown to be models of the order-enriched Lawvere theory of subconvex sets and later used to adequately interpret PFPC, a probabilistic version of the well-known functional programming language FPC (Fixed Point Calculus) [8], which involves recursive types.

Introduction

The study of the interplay between convexity and order in the semantics of probabilistic programs has been a highly-coveted field of research since the first research programs on the semantics of probabilistic computing, a programming language paradigm which allows probabilistic branching of programs. Building on this rich heritage, our research lead us to a refined view on the denotational semantics of Probabilistic Call-by-Name FPC (or shortly PFPC), which does not involve a free construction on the probabilistic powerdomain [12,13].

Starting from an intuitive and minimalistic programming language perspective on Keimel & Plotkin's approach to probabilistic computations [14], the present work provides a new take on the mathematical characterization of probabilistic programs and brings an important building block for the study of the interactions between the concepts of convexity and order within the theory of probabilistic computing, with close ties to the mathematical study of quantum computations [19, 21, 23].

Although the main example of probabilistic extension of Haskell, Hakaru [18], involves Call-by-Value evaluations due to the use of monads, one could think about a probabilistic extension of Haskell more instrisinct to the language, and for which our PFPC would be a reasonable abstraction. Such a language with Call-by-Name evaluations easily allows convex combination of lists.

The choice of a Call-by-Name execution strategy is far from trivial, since it implies that randomized evaluations are probabilistically independent of each other. That is to say, in our language, a program may involve multiple uses of the same data, with different outcomes.

1998 ACM Subject Classification: F.3.2 Semantics of Programming Languages.
Key words and phrases: convex set, kegelspitze, domain, recursive type, probabilistic computation.

LOGICAL METHODS
IN COMPUTER SCIENCE
DOI:10.2168/LMCS-???
© Mathys Rennela
Creative Commons

This paper defines the language PFPC as the first probabilistic extension of the Call-by-Name FPC language [16]. It diverges from the canonical model of the language FPC and introduces Kegelspitzen as pointed dcpos with a compatible convex structure which carries a clear probabilistic interpretation, which is the essence of probabilistic coherence spaces [5,9], a well-established model of Probabilistic PCF [3,6]. To be precise, we considered in our work the category **KS** of Kegelspitzen and affine Scott-continuous maps, i.e. Scott-continuous maps which preserve the convex structures. This alternative model allows an interpretation of recursive types, and is associated to an adequacy theorem for all types.

In detail, types are interpreted as locally Scott-continuous functors, i.e. functors $F : |\mathbf{KS}|^n \to |\mathbf{KS}|$ (where $|C|$ is short for $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{op}} \times \mathcal{C}$) such that for every pair of objects $(X, Y) \in |\mathbf{KS}|^{2n}$, the map $F_{X,Y} : |\mathbf{KS}|^n(X, Y) \to |\mathbf{KS}|(FX, FY)$ is Scott-continuous. As for terms, they are denoted by natural Scott-continuous transformations, i.e. natural families of Scott-continuous maps.

This simple model offers a refined view on the inner convexity of probabilistic computations, but also opens the path for the denotational study of a probabilistic extension of Call-by-Push-Value FPC [4] and paves the way to a denotational study of higher-order quantum computation with recursive types, inspired by the author's previous work [20, 21].

After explicitely defining the language PFPC and giving a few examples of meaningful programs in Section 1, Kegelspitzen will be introduced in Section 2 and the denotational semantics will be exposed in Section 4 and proven to be computationally adequate for all types in Section 5.

1. Probabilistic Call-by-Name FPC

In this section, the language Call-by-Name FPC will be extended with probabilistic choice, to allow convex combinations of terms, resulting in a language that we will call PFPC – which is short for Probabilistic Call-by-Name FPC. A weak head-reduction (i.e. lazy call-by-name) operational semantics for the language PFPC is provided. For the sake of convenience, the rules for the formation of types, the grammar, the typing rules and the reduction rules have been aggregated in Fig. 1.

By convention, type variables are denoted by capital letters $X, Y, Z, \ldots$ while term variables are denoted by small letters $x, y, z, \ldots$ and types by greek letters $\tau, \sigma, \upsilon, \ldots$. As for recursive types, the variable X is bound in the recursive type $\mu X.\tau$. Terms are denoted by capital letters $M, N, P, \ldots$ and the notation $M : \tau$ means that the term M is of type τ.

The formation of types is described in Fig. 1. Well-formed types $\Theta \vdash \tau$ are composed of a list Θ of disjoint type variables and a type τ whose free type variables are in Θ. That is to say, if a variable X of type τ is in the typing context $\Theta \vdash \Gamma$, then $\Theta \vdash \tau$ must be a well-formed type. A closed type τ is a well-formed type $\vdash \tau$.

One writes $M[x \mapsto N]$ for the term M in which every occurence of the variable x has been replaced by the term N. Similarly, one writes $\sigma[X \mapsto \tau]$ for the type σ in which every occurence of the type variable X has been replaced by the type τ. In particular, we will consider that the recursive type $\mu X.\tau$ is equivalent to the type $\tau[X \mapsto \mu X.\tau]$.

$$\text{Types } \sigma, \rho ::= X \mid \mu X.\tau \mid \sigma \Rightarrow \tau \mid \sigma + \tau \mid \sigma \times \tau$$

$$\frac{}{\Theta, X \vdash X} \qquad \frac{\Theta, X \vdash \tau}{\Theta \vdash \mu X.\tau} \qquad \frac{\Theta \vdash \tau \quad \Theta \vdash \sigma}{\Theta \vdash \tau + \sigma} \qquad \frac{\Theta \vdash \tau \quad \Theta \vdash \sigma}{\Theta \vdash \tau \times \sigma} \qquad \frac{\Theta \vdash \tau \quad \Theta \vdash \sigma}{\Theta \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \sigma}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Terms } M, N, P ::= {} & x \mid \mathsf{inl}_{\sigma,\tau}(M) \mid \mathsf{inr}_{\sigma,\tau}(M) \mid \mathsf{case}(M) \text{ of } \mathsf{inl}(x).N \text{ or } \mathsf{inr}(y).P \\ & \mid (M, N) \mid \mathsf{fst}(M) \mid \mathsf{snd}(M) \mid \mathsf{intro}_{\mu X.\tau}(M) \mid \mathsf{elim}(M) \\ & \mid \lambda x^{\sigma}.M \mid (M)N \mid M \oplus_{\kappa} N\end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{}{\Theta \mid \Gamma, x : \alpha \vdash x : \alpha} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma, x : \alpha \vdash M : \beta}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \lambda x^{\alpha}.M : \alpha \Rightarrow \beta}$$

$$\frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \alpha}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash (M)N : \beta} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash N : \tau}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M \oplus_{\kappa} N : \tau}$$

$$\frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \sigma}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{inl}_{\tau,\sigma}(M) : \tau + \sigma} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \sigma}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{inr}_{\sigma,\tau}(M) : \sigma + \tau}$$

$$\frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma + \upsilon \quad \Theta \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash N : \tau \quad \Theta \mid \Gamma, y : \upsilon \vdash P : \tau}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{case}(M) \text{ of } \mathsf{inl}(x).N \text{ or } \mathsf{inr}(y).P : \tau}$$

$$\frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \times \sigma}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{fst}(M) : \tau} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \times \sigma}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{snd}(M) : \sigma} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \quad \Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash (M, N) : \tau \times \sigma}$$

$$\frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau[X \mapsto \mu X.\tau]}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{intro}_{\mu X.\tau}(M) : \mu X.\tau} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \mu X.\tau}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{elim}(M) : \tau[X \mapsto \mu X.\tau]}$$

$$\frac{}{(\lambda x^{\alpha}.M)N \xrightarrow{1} M[x \mapsto N]} \qquad \frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} M'}{\lambda x.M \xrightarrow{\kappa} \lambda x.M'} \qquad \frac{}{M \oplus_{\kappa} N \xrightarrow{\kappa} M} \qquad \frac{}{M \oplus_{\kappa} N \xrightarrow{1-\kappa} N}$$

$$\frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} (N, P)}{\mathsf{fst}(M) \xrightarrow{\kappa} N} \qquad \frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} (N, P)}{\mathsf{snd}(M) \xrightarrow{\kappa} P} \qquad \frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} M' \qquad N \xrightarrow{\kappa} N'}{(M, N) \xrightarrow{\kappa} (M', N')}$$

$$\frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} N}{\mathsf{inl}(M) \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathsf{inl}(N)} \qquad \frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} N}{\mathsf{inr}(M) \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathsf{inr}(N)} \qquad \frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathsf{inl}(L)}{\mathsf{case}(M) \text{ of } \mathsf{inl}(x).N \text{ or } \mathsf{inr}(y).P \xrightarrow{\kappa} N[x \mapsto L]}$$

$$\frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathsf{intro}_{\mu X.\tau}(N)}{\mathsf{elim}(M) \xrightarrow{\kappa} N} \qquad \frac{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathsf{inr}(R)}{\mathsf{case}(M) \text{ of } \mathsf{inl}(x).N \text{ or } \mathsf{inr}(y).P \xrightarrow{\kappa} P[y \mapsto R]}$$

FIGURE 1. Grammar, typing rules and call-by-name operational semantics

A probabilistic transition $M \xrightarrow{\kappa} N$ is a reduction from the term M to the term N with probability $\kappa \in [0,1]$. A deterministic reduction is a reduction for which the probabilistic reduction rule is not used, i.e. $\kappa = 1$. Such a reduction will be written with the arrow $\to_d$. It is clear that if $M \to_d M'$ and $M \to_d M''$, then $M' = M''$.

To sum up, a judgement $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ is a term M in context $\Gamma = (x_1 : \tau_1, \dots, x_n : \tau_n)$ with well-formed types $\Theta \vdash \tau_i$. We write $\mathsf{dom}(\Gamma)$ for the set $\{x_i\}_i$. In the judgement $\Theta \mid \Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash M : \sigma$, it is implicit that Γ and Γ' are distinct contexts, i.e. $\mathsf{dom}(\Gamma) \cap \mathsf{dom}(\Gamma') = \emptyset$. In particular, in the judgement $\Theta \mid \Gamma, x : \tau \vdash M : \sigma$, the variable x is not in $\mathsf{dom}(\Gamma)$. In this setting, $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ is used as a shortcut for $- \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau$.

Our operational semantics enjoys the following standard properties.

Lemma 1.1 (Subject reduction)**.**
If $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ and $M \xrightarrow{\kappa} M'$, then $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M' : \sigma$.

Lemma 1.2 (Substitution Lemma)**.**
Suppose that $\Theta \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau$ and $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash P : \sigma$.
If $M \to_d M'$ then $M[x \mapsto P] \to_d M'[x \mapsto P]$.

Proof. Terms which apply a term to another are the non-trivial cases of the proof by induction on terms of this lemma.

Consider a term $M = (N)L$, when N isn't an abtraction and reduces to another term N'. Then, the reduction $N \to_d N'$ implies that there is a reduction $M = (N)L \to_d (N')L$, and since $M \to_d M'$ by hypothesis, we have that $M' = (N')L$.

Now, assuming that $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash P : \sigma$, one can deduce that $N[x \mapsto P]$ is not an abstraction since N isn't, and finally by induction hypothesis, $N[x \mapsto P] \to_d N'[x \mapsto P]$ and therefore:

$$((N)L)[x \mapsto P] = (N[x \mapsto P])L[x \mapsto P] \to_d (N'[x \mapsto P])L[x \mapsto P] = ((N')L)[x \mapsto P]$$

□

1.1. **Examples of probabilistic programs.** In the remaining part of this section, some examples of PFPC programs will be given.

1.1.1. *Probabilistic booleans.* The void type $0 \equiv \mu X.X$ is the type with no normal forms. The unit type $1 \equiv 0 \Rightarrow 0$ has a unique inhabitant $\mathsf{unit} \equiv \lambda x^0.x : 0$. The type bool can be defined as the type $1 + 1$.

Then, True and False are defined as $\mathsf{inl}(\mathsf{unit})$ and $\mathsf{inr}(\mathsf{unit})$ respectively. It follows that the tossing of a fair coin is represented by the program

$$\mathsf{cointoss} \equiv \mathsf{True} \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}} \mathsf{False} : \mathsf{bool}$$

and the conditional branching by the syntactic sugar

$$\mathsf{if}(t, a, b) \equiv \mathsf{case}(t)\ \mathsf{of}\ \mathsf{inl}(x).a\ \mathsf{or}\ \mathsf{inr}(y).b \text{ for } t : \mathsf{bool}$$

Consider the following program, which implements a geometric distribution:

$$\mathsf{geo} \equiv \mathsf{fix}(\lambda b.\mathsf{if}(\mathsf{cointoss}, \underline{0}, b))$$

The sample is the number of heads before you get a tail. The probability of non-termination is zero.

1.1.2. *Untyped lambda-calculus and fixpoints.* Consider the function type $\mathsf{fun} \equiv \mu X.(X \Rightarrow X)$, which entails the equivalence $\mathsf{fun} \cong \mathsf{fun} \Rightarrow \mathsf{fun}$. Then the curryfication $\mathsf{curry}(M)$ of a term $M : \mathsf{fun}$ is simply the term $\mathsf{elim}(M)$ and the application $\mathsf{apply}(M)$ of a term $M : \mathsf{fun} \Rightarrow \mathsf{fun}$ is encoded by the term $\mathsf{intro(M)}$. In the line of Scott's work, the type fun can be used to interpret a probabilistic extension of the untyped λ-calculus [5]. Additionally, one can define the operator fix as $\lambda f.(\lambda x.f(xx))(\lambda x.f(xx))$.

1.1.3. *Generating a list of random numbers.* In PFPC, the type nat is defined as the type $\mu X.1 + X$. Then, the numeral $\underline{0}$ is the term $\mathsf{intro}(\mathsf{inl}(\mathsf{unit}))$ and the successor $\mathsf{s}(M)$ of a numeral $M : \mathsf{nat}$ is the term $\mathsf{intro}(\mathsf{inr}(M))$.

Similarly, the type $\mathsf{natlist}$ for lists of numerals is the type $\mu X.1 + (\mathsf{nat} \times X)$. Then the empty list nil is encoded by the term $\mathsf{intro}(\mathsf{inl}(\mathsf{unit})) : \mathsf{natlist}$ and the construction of lists $\mathsf{cons}(M)$ corresponds to the term $\mathsf{intro}(\mathsf{inr}(M)) : \mathsf{natlist}$ for any term $M : \mathsf{nat} \times \mathsf{natlist}$. More generally, the type $\mu X.1 + (\tau \times X)$ represents lists of type τ.

Now, consider the program represented by the term $M \equiv \mathsf{fix}(\lambda x^{\mathsf{nat}}.\underline{0} \oplus x) : \mathsf{nat}$. It reduces to the numeral $\underline{0}$ with probability $\sum_{n\geq 0} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} = 1$. Similarly, the program represented by the term $\mathsf{rand} \equiv \mathsf{fix}(\lambda x^{\mathsf{nat}}.\underline{0} \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}} \mathsf{s}(x)) : \mathsf{nat}$. Moreover, it reduces to the numeral $\underline{n}$ with probability $\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$ (and therefore corresponds to a one-dimensional probabilistic walk with a wall on the left).

Then, the following Haskell-style program and its PFPC equivalent generate a list of random numbers of random length.

```
val cointoss: nat
val rand: nat
val rlist: natlist
let rec rlist l := rand :: (if cointoss
    then [] else (rlist l))
```

$$\mathsf{cointoss} \equiv \underline{0} \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}} \underline{1} : \mathsf{nat}$$
$$\mathsf{rand} \equiv \mathsf{fix}(\lambda x^{\mathsf{nat}}.\underline{0} \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}} \mathsf{s}(x)) : \mathsf{nat}$$
$$\mathsf{rlist} : \mathsf{natlist}$$
$$\mathsf{rlist} \equiv \mathsf{fix}(\lambda l.\, \mathsf{cons}(\mathsf{rand}, \mathsf{if}(\mathsf{cointoss}, \mathsf{nil}, l))$$

1.1.4. *Non-uniform distribution.* In our functional programming language, a finite sequence of terms $\{E_i\}_i$ can be probabilistically combined to form a non-uniform distribution, which can take the form of the following term:

$$\prod_{1\leq i\leq n} p_i \cdot E_i = E_1 \oplus_{\kappa_1} (E_2 \oplus_{\kappa_2} (\cdots \oplus_{\kappa_{n-1}} E_n) \cdots)$$

where $\kappa_i \in [0,1] (i < n)$, $p_i = \kappa_i \times \prod_{j<i}(1-p_j)$ for $1 \leq i < n$ and $p_n = \prod_{j<n}(1-p_j)$.

1.1.5. *Lifting.* The lifting of a type τ is defined as the type $\tau_\perp \equiv 1 \Rightarrow \tau$. Such a type is commonly called a lifted type. The manipulation of lifted types relies on the constants

$$\mathsf{thunk} \equiv \lambda y^{\tau}.\lambda x^{1}.y : \tau \Rightarrow \tau_\perp \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathsf{force} \equiv \lambda f^{\tau_\perp}.f(\mathsf{unit}) : \tau_\perp \Rightarrow \tau$$

associated to the following typing rules:

$$\frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma, x : 1 \vdash M : \sigma}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{thunk}(M) : \sigma_\perp} \qquad \frac{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma_\perp \quad \Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{unit} : 1}{\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{force}(M) : \sigma}$$

A direct application of those constructions can be found in the following type, commonly known as the type of lazy lists for natural numbers, which allows a delay in the evaluation of the tail of a list of numbers:

$$\mu X.\mathsf{unit} + (\mathsf{nat} \times X_\perp)$$

2. An introduction to the theory of Kegelspitzen

In this section, we will give a concise introduction to Kegelspitzen as pointed dcpos with a compatible convex structure which carries a clear probabilistic interpretation. Brainchild of Keimel & Plotkin [14], the word "Kegelspitze" is the german term for "cone tip" and its plural is therefore"Kegelspitzen". It is important that Kegelspitzen constitute the essence of probabilistic coherence spaces [5, 9], another well-studied model of probabilistic computation, in the sense that a Kegelspitze partially describe the domain-theoretic behaviour of the carreer of a probabilistic coherence spaces.

Let us start with some notions of domain theory. A non-empty subset Δ of a poset P is called *directed* if every pair of elements of Δ has an upper bound in Δ. We denote it by $\Delta \subseteq_{dir} P$. A poset P is a *directed-complete partial order* (dcpo) if each directed subset has a least upper bound. A function $f : P \to Q$ between two posets P and Q is strict if $f(\perp_P) = \perp_Q$, is *monotonic* if it preserves the order and *Scott-continuous* if it preserves directed joins. We denote by $\mathbf{Dcpo}_\perp$ (resp. $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$) the category of dcpos with bottoms as objects and Scott-continuous maps (resp. strict Scott-continuous maps) as morphisms. The interested reader will find in [1] a comprehensive introduction to domain theory.

A *convex set*[1] is a set X together with an m-ary function $r_X : X^m \to X$ for each vector $r = (r_1 \dots r_m)$ of non-negative real numbers with $\sum_i r_i = 1$, such that for each i, $\delta^{i,m}_X(x_1, \dots x_m) = x_i$, and for each $m \times n$ matrix $(s_{i,j})_{i,j}$ of non-negative real numbers such that $\sum_j s_{i,j} = 1$, we have $\sum_i r_i \cdot (\sum_j (s_{i,j}.x_j)) = \sum_j ((\sum_i (r_i \cdot s_{i,j})) \cdot x_j)$. A subconvex set is a convex set with a distinguished element zero, canonically denoted by 0.

A *convex dcpo* is a convex set equipped with a dcpo structure such that the functions that constitute its convex structure are Scott-continuous. A simple example of a convex dcpo is the unit interval $[0, 1]$ of the reals. We will consider the category $\mathbf{dConv}$ of convex dcpos and affine Scott-continuous maps, i.e. Scott-continuous functions which preserve the algebraic structure. For two convex dcpos D_1 and D_2, the homset $\mathbf{dConv}(D_1, D_2)$ can be seen as a dcpo (and is considered as such in this paper) or as a convex set.

A *subconvex dcpo* is a convex set and a dcpo whose least element is a zero element for the convex structure. We will consider the category $\mathbf{dConv}_{\leq 1}$ of subconvex dcpos and affine strict Scott-continuous maps.

A *Kegelspitze* is a pointed convex dcpo X with a convex structure such that the scalar multiplication $\cdot : [0, 1] \times X \to X$, defined by $\lambda \cdot x = x \oplus_\lambda \perp$, is Scott-continuous in both argument. Equivalently, since $[0, 1]$ carries the Scott topology, the requirement is that the

[1]The definition of convex sets can be reformulated in terms of a weighted binary addition (e.g. [14]). For example, a subset of a real vector space is convex if it is closed under convex sums.

scalar multiplication is continuous in the product topology of its domain. We will refer to this assumption as the "Kegelspitzen condition". The interested reader can report to [14] for more details.

Alternatively, one can define a Kegelspitze as a pointed convex dcpo X, in which the following maps are continuous in both arguments:

- $f : [0,1] \times X^2 \to X$ defined by $f(\lambda,(x,y)) = x \oplus_\lambda y$ where $[0,1]$ is endowed in the usual Hausdorff topology
- for every natural number n, $f : S_n \times X^n \to X$ defined by $((\lambda_i)_{i\leq n},(x_i)_{i\leq n}) \mapsto \sum_i \lambda_i \cdot x_i$ where $S_n = \mathcal{D}(n) \cong \{(q_1,\cdots,q_n) \in [0,1]^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \leq 1\}$ carries the Scott topology

Naturally, a *homomorphism of Kegelspitzen* is an affine strict Scott-continuous map of Kegelspitzen. Homomorphisms will be called *linear maps*. Then, the category **KS** is the category of Kegelspitzen and linear Scott-continuous maps between them.

The unit interval of the reals and the normal state spaces of W*-algebras are among the most obvious examples of Kegelspitzen. For an historical account of the different notions of Kegelspitzen, see [14, Remark 2.28].

Since we intend to use Kegelspitzen as a categorical model for higher-order probabilistic computation, it seems natural to wonder how recursive types will be denoted in our framework. In short, we intend to obtain the semantics of recursive types through the algebraic compactness of the category **KS**, which is established in the Appendix A.

3. A categorical account of convexity and order

In this section, we will formally justify the definition of Kegelspitzen by proving that they are models of the order-enriched Lawvere theory of subconvex sets in the category of pointed dcpos.

Consider $\mathbb{L}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}$ to be the Lawvere theories of the equational theories of convex sets and subconvex sets respectively. That is to say, $\mathbb{L}$ (resp. $\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}$) is the opposite category of free $\mathcal{D}^\infty$-algebras (resp. free $\mathcal{D}^\infty_{\leq 1}$-algebras) on finitely many generators.

To be precise, the Lawvere theory $\mathbb{L}$ (resp. $\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}$) is the category of natural numbers as objects together with arrows $n \to m$ seen as the set $\mathcal{D}^\infty(n)^m$ (resp. the set $\mathcal{D}^\infty_{\leq 1}(n)^m$), where $\mathcal{D}^\infty$ (resp. $\mathcal{D}^\infty_{\leq 1}$) is the infinitary (sub)probabilistic discrete distribution monad:

$$\mathcal{D}^\infty(X) = \{\varphi : X \to [0,1] \mid \sum_x \phi(x) = 1\} \qquad \mathcal{D}^\infty_{\leq 1}(X) = \{\varphi : X \to [0,1] \mid \sum_x \phi(x) \leq 1\}$$

For monoidal categories $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{D}$, we will denote by $[\mathbf{C},\mathbf{D}]_\times$, the category of finite-product preserving functors from $\mathbf{C}$ to $\mathbf{D}$. Therefore, when the category $\mathbf{C}$ is a Lawvere theory, this will be the denotation of the category of models of the category $\mathbf{C}$ in the category $\mathbf{D}$, and more simply the category of models of the category $\mathbf{C}$ when the category $\mathbf{D}$ is the category **Set** of sets.

The following proposition comes from the fact that the category of convex sets is the Eilenberg-Moore category of the distribution monad and from [11, Thm. 6.3.3].

Proposition 3.1. The category **Conv** of convex sets and affine maps is equivalent to the category $[\mathbb{L}, \mathbf{Set}]_\times$ of models of the Lawvere theory $\mathbb{L}$ of convex sets.

Any convex dcpo X can be identified with a (finite) product-preserving functor $\Phi(X) : \mathbb{L} \to \mathbf{Dcpo}$, i.e. a model of the Lawvere theory $\mathbb{L}$ in the category **Dcpo**, defined as follows. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Phi(X)(n) = X^n \in \mathbf{Dcpo}$. Consider a function $r : n \to 1$, n-ary operation definable in the Lawvere theory $\mathbb{L}$ of convex sets. That is to say, the operation r is defined as $r : (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto \sum_i r_i \cdot x_i$ for a family of positive reals $\{r_i\}_{i \leq n}$ such that $\sum_i r_i = 1$. It induces a function $f : X^n \to X$, defined by $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_i r_i \cdot x_i$, which is Scott-continuous as a convex combination of the convex dcpo X. We can now take f to be $\Phi(X)(r)$.

Then the mapping Φ can be turned into a functor $\Phi : \mathbf{dConv} \to [\mathbb{L}, \mathbf{Dcpo}]_\times$ which acts as follows on maps: an affine map $f : X \to Y$ is associated to a natural family of Scott-continuous maps $\Phi(f) : \Phi(X) \Rightarrow \Phi(Y)$, where $\Phi(f)(n) : X^n \to Y^n$ is the Scott-continuous map $f^n : (x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mapsto (f(x_i))_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, consider a natural transformation $\alpha : \Phi(X) \Rightarrow \Phi(Y)$ for some convex dcpos X and Y. By construction, the Scott-continuous map $\alpha_1 : X \to Y$ is affine and induces the natural transformation α. From this observation it can be deduced that the functor Φ is full and faithful and turns out to be essentially surjective: a model $F : \mathbb{L} \to \mathbf{Dcpo}$ is equivalent to the model $\Phi(X)$, where X is the convex dcpo formed by the dcpo $F(1)$ together with the Scott-continuous convex structure $F(\mathbb{L}(n, 1))$.

Proposition 3.2. The category **dConv** of convex dcpos and Scott-continuous affine maps is equivalent to the category $[\mathbb{L}, \mathbf{Dcpo}]_\times$ of models of the Lawvere theory $\mathbb{L}$ of convex sets in the category **Dcpo** of dcpos and Scott-continuous maps.

Using the same reasoning, there is a similar result for Kegelspitzen. Namely, Kegelspitzen are models of the Lawvere theory $\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}$ in the category $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$. More interestingly, it turns out that the Kegeltpitzen condition can be expressed in functorial-theoretic terms and therefore we will show in the remaining part of this section that there is a categorical construction which takes into account the mathematical specificities of Kegelspitzen, as expressed in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3. The category **KS** of Kegelspitzen and affine Scott-continuous maps is equivalent to the category $[\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}, \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}]_\times$ of models of the $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-enriched Lawvere theory of subconvex sets in the category.

Let us now try to grasp the essence of the proof of this theorem, which finds its inventiveness in the categorical expression of the Kegelspitzen condition. Indeed, considering that the whole functorial construction of Kegelspitzen as models of a Lawvere theory can be adapted from our reasoning on convex sets in Prop. 3.1 and if one keeps in mind the fact that Kegelspitzen can be equivalently defined as dcpos X with Scott-continuous maps $D_n \times X^n \to X$ which associate a distribution $(r_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in D_n$ and a product $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in X^n$ to the convex sum $\sum_i r_i \cdot x_i \in X$, one can define a functor $\Phi : \mathbf{KS} \to [\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}, \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}]_\times$ which acts as follows on objects:

$$\Phi(X)(n) = X^n (n \in \mathbb{N})$$

$$\Phi(X)(r): \quad D_n \times X^n \to X \qquad (\text{for } r \in \mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}(n,1))$$
$$((r_i)_i, (x_i)_i) \mapsto \sum_i r_i \cdot x_i$$

In order to express categorically the Kegelspitzen condition, we first need to recall that for every natural number n, the domain of subprobability distributions over a set of cardinality n is the dcpo [14, Remark 2.39]:

$$\{(x_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \in [0,1]^n \mid \sum_i x_i \leq 1\}$$

The cpo-enriched Lawvere theory of pointed dcpos has two operations:

$$p : X^0 \to X \qquad \text{and} \qquad q : S \times X \to X \qquad \text{where } S \text{ is the dcpo } \{0 < 1\}$$
$$(0,x) \mapsto p()$$
$$(1,x) \mapsto x$$

Then, the dcpo X has a bottom which is $p()$ since the requirement that $q : S \times X \to X$ is Scott-continuous (and therefore monotone) entails that $p() = q(0,x) \leq q(1,x) = x$ for every $x \in X$ (considering that $(0,x) \leq (1,x)$).

This trick can be replicated in the theory of subconvex sets without modifying it. Indeed, from the observation that S is a sub-dcpo of the dcpo $D_1 = [0,1]$, one can deduce that every Scott-continuous (and therefore monotone) map $r : [0,1] \times X \to X$ is such that $0 = r(0,x) \leq (1,x) = x$ for every $x \in X$. Therefore, every model of the dcpo-enriched Lawvere theory of subconvex sets admits the zero element 0 as bottom.

4. Denotational semantics

We can now fully describe our denotational model. In our language, the semantics of every type must have a structure which supports convex sum (since this is in the syntax). Therefore, the interpretation of types as Kegelspitzen is natural and justified in the Call-by-Name paradigm.

Type judgements $\Theta \vdash \tau$ are denoted by symmetric locally Scott-continuous n-ary functors $[\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!] : |\mathbf{KS}|^n \to |\mathbf{KS}|$, where n, Θ_i and π_i are respectively the length, the i-th member and the projection of the i-th coordinate of the list Θ.

$$[\![\Theta \vdash \Theta_i]\!] = \pi_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n$$

and for objects $e_+ \in \mathbf{KS}^n$ and $e_- \in (\mathbf{KS}^{op})^n$,

$$[\![\Theta \vdash \tau + \sigma]\!](e_+, e_-) = \mathcal{V}_{\leq 1}(U[\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!](e_+, e_-) + U[\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!](e_+, e_-))$$

where the operation $+$ is the canonical sum of dcpos, the functor $\mathcal{V}_{\leq 1} : \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!} \to \mathbf{KS}$ is a functor obtained from the subprobabilistic power domain monad [14, Ex. 2.37] and the functor $U : \mathbf{KS} \to \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$ is the canonical forgetful functor.

On that matter, it should be noted that this construction bears some similarities with the interpretation of sums in the Levy's call-by-push-value calculus [15].

$$[\![\Theta \vdash \tau \times \sigma]\!](e_+, e_-) = [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!](e_+, e_-) \times [\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!](e_+, e_-)$$

where the product $\times$ is the operation which gives the product of two Kegelspitzen, ordered component wise (see [21, 3.1.1]).

$$[\![\Theta \vdash \tau \Rightarrow \sigma]\!](e_+, e_-) = [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!](e_-, e_+) \Rightarrow [\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!](e_+, e_-)$$

where the arrow functor $\Rightarrow\colon |\mathbf{KS}|^n \to \mathbf{KS}^n$ is the cotensor functor defined by $A \Rightarrow B := \mathbf{Dcpo}(A, B)$ on objects and acts as follows on maps:

$$\Rightarrow (f : A \to B, g : C \to D)(h) = g \circ h \circ f \in A \Rightarrow D \text{ for } h \in B \Rightarrow C$$

Indeed, the structure $A \Rightarrow B$ is a Kegelspitzen whose convex structure and pointed dcpo structure are defined pointwise on the Kegelspitzen B. Then, it is easy to see that convex combinations of Scott-continuous maps in the homset $\mathbf{Dcpo}(A, B)$ are again Scott-continuous, making $A \Rightarrow B$ convex and therefore a Kegelspitze since its convex structure is composed of Scott-continuous maps which satisfy the Kegelspitze condition.

As for recursive types $\Theta \vdash \mu X.\tau$, they will be interpreted as the initial algebra, or equivalently the final coalgebra, of the functor $[\![\Theta, X \vdash \tau]\!]$, i.e. $[\![\Theta \vdash \mu X.\tau]\!]_e = \mu([\![\Theta, X \vdash \tau]\!]_e)$. We refer the interested reader to Appendix A for more details about this standard construction of μF for a locally continuous endofunctor F.

The interpretation of types entails the following lemma, proven by straightforward structural induction on terms [8].

Lemma 4.1 (Substitution Lemma)**.** There exists a canonical isomorphism:

$$\beta : [\![\Theta \vdash \tau[x \mapsto \sigma]]\!] \cong [\![\Theta, x \vdash \tau]\!](\mathsf{Id}, [\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!])$$

The denotations of context environments $\Theta \vdash \Gamma$ is defined by induction as follows:

$$[\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma, x : \tau]\!] = [\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma]\!] \times [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!]$$

Judgements $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ are denoted by natural transformations

$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau]\!] : [\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma]\!] \Rightarrow [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!],$$

i.e. natural families of pairs of Scott-continuous maps

$$\{[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau]\!]_e : [\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma]\!]_e \to [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!]_e\}_{e \in |\mathbf{KS}|^n}$$

Consider an element e in $|\mathbf{KS}|^n$. We define the semantics of judgements as follows:

$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash x_i : \tau_i]\!]_e = \pi_i$$
$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{inl}(M) : \tau + \sigma]\!]_e = \eta \circ \amalg_1 \circ [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau]\!]_e$$
$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{inr}(M) : \tau + \sigma]\!]_e = \eta \circ \amalg_2 \circ [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma]\!]_e$$

where $\amalg_1 : [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!]_e \to [\![\Theta \vdash \tau + \sigma]\!]_e$ and $\amalg_2 : [\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!]_e \to [\![\Theta \vdash \tau + \sigma]\!]_e$ are the canonical coprojections, and $\eta : \mathsf{Id} \Rightarrow U\mathcal{V}_{\leq 1}$ is the unit of the adjunction $\mathcal{V}_{\leq 1} \dashv U$ [13].

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{case}(M) \text{ of } \mathsf{inl}(x).N \text{ or } \mathsf{inr}(y).P : \tau]\!]_e \\
&\quad = U\varepsilon \circ U\mathcal{V}_{\leq 1}([[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash N : \tau]\!]_e, [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma, y : \upsilon \vdash P : \tau]\!]_e] \circ \delta_e) \\
&\quad \circ \psi \circ (\eta, [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma + \upsilon]\!]_e)
\end{aligned}$$

where the morphism δ_e is the canonical isomorphism

$$[\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma]\!]_e \times ([\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!]_e + [\![\Theta \vdash \upsilon]\!]_e) \cong ([\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma]\!]_e \times [\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!]_e) + ([\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma]\!]_e \times [\![\Theta \vdash \upsilon]\!]_e)$$

which distributes products over sums, the morphism $\varepsilon : \mathcal{V}_{\leq 1}U \Rightarrow \mathsf{Id}$ is the counit of the adjunction $\mathcal{V}_{\leq 1} \dashv U$ and the morphism ψ is the double strength defined in [13] by $\psi(\mu, \mu')(U) = \int_x \int_y \chi_U(x, y)\, d\mu\, d\mu'$, where χ_U is the characteristic map[2] of the open set U.

$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash (M, N) : \tau \times \sigma]\!]_e = ([\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau]\!]_e, [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma]\!]_e)$$
$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{fst}(M) : \tau]\!]_e = \pi_1 \circ [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \times \sigma]\!]_e$$
$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{snd}(M) : \sigma]\!]_e = \pi_2 \circ [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau \times \sigma]\!]_e$$

where $\pi_1 : [\![\Theta \vdash \tau \times \sigma]\!]_e \to [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!]_e$ and $\pi_2 : [\![\Theta \vdash \tau \times \sigma]\!]_e \to [\![\Theta \vdash \sigma]\!]_e$ are canonical projections.

$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \lambda x^{\sigma}.M : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau]\!]_e(\rho)(x) = [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash M : \tau]\!]_e(\rho, x)$$
$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M(N) : \tau]\!]_e(\rho) = [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau]\!]_e(\rho)([\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma]\!]_e(\rho))$$

Consider a recursive type $\Theta \vdash \mu X.\tau$. We define the natural isomorphism $\textsc{intro}_e$ to be the composition $\varphi^{[\![\Theta, X \vdash \tau]\!]_e} \circ \beta$ of natural isomorphisms, where the pair $(\mu[\![\Theta, X \vdash \tau]\!]_e, \varphi^{[\![\Theta, X \vdash \tau]\!]_e})$ is the initial $[\![\Theta, X \vdash \tau]\!]_e$-algebra, whose construction is detailed in Appendix A. The inverse of $\textsc{intro}_e$ will be denoted by $\textsc{elim}_e$.

$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{intro}(M) : \mu X.\tau]\!]_e = \textsc{intro}_e \circ [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau[X \mapsto \mu X.\tau]]\!]_e$$
$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{elim}(M) : \tau[X \mapsto \mu X.\tau]]\!]_e = \textsc{elim}_e \circ [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \mu X.\tau]\!]_e$$

Probabilistic choice will be denoted as follows:

$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M \oplus_{\kappa} N : \tau]\!]_e = \kappa \cdot [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \tau]\!]_e + (1 - \kappa) \cdot [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash N : \tau]\!]_e$$

which is a convex sum in the Kegelspitze $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp !}([\![\Theta \vdash \Gamma]\!]_e, [\![\Theta \vdash \tau]\!]_e)$.

5. Computational adequacy

In the following section, it will be shown that Kegelspitzen form a computationally adequate model for PFPC. Firstly, we will exploit the following standard lemma, which can be proven by straightforward induction on terms.

Lemma 5.1 (Invariance of the interpretation)**.**
Suppose that $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$. Then, the following equality holds

$$[\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M : \sigma]\!]_e = \sum_{M \xrightarrow{\kappa} M'} [\![\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M' : \sigma]\!]_e$$

One can observe that the expressions of the invariance of interpretation for terms $\Theta \mid \Gamma \vdash M \oplus N : \sigma$ is formulated in the same way as their denotations.

Secondly, the adequacy theorem will rely on a reorganization of the set of all PFPC terms as a Markov process [3, 6].

[2]For every set X, the characteristic map χ_A of a subset $A \subseteq X$ is the function defined by $\chi_A(x) = 1$ when $x \in A$ and by $\chi_A(x) = 0$ otherwise.

Definition 5.2. For terms M and M', we define the following matrix:

$$\mathsf{Prob}_{M,M'} = \begin{cases} \lambda \text{ if } M \xrightarrow{\lambda} M' \\ 1 \text{ if } M = M' \text{ is in head normal form} \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The following lemma is a restatement of the invariance of interpretation.

Lemma 5.3. Consider a closed type $\vdash \sigma$. For judgements $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ and $\Gamma \vdash M' : \sigma$ such that $\mathsf{Prob}_{M,M'} > 0$,

$$[\![\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma]\!] = \sum_{M' \text{ term}} \mathsf{Prob}_{M,M'} \cdot [\![\Gamma \vdash M' : \sigma]\!]$$

Normal forms, like unit, form a set that we will call Σ and define by the following grammar:

$$V, W ::= (V, W) \mid \mathsf{inl}(V) \mid \mathsf{inr}(V) \mid \mathsf{intro}_{\mu X.\tau}(M) \mid \lambda x^{\sigma}.M$$

By applying repetitively this lemma and considering the specific case of normal forms, one obtains the following corollary.

Corollary 5.4. Consider closed types $\vdash \tau$ and $\vdash \sigma$.
For $\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the following equality holds

$$[\![\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma]\!] = \sum_{M' \text{ term}} \mathsf{Prob}^k_{M,M'} [\![\Gamma \vdash M' : \sigma]\!].$$

Then, for a closed term $\vdash M : \tau$, the following inequality where $\mathsf{Prob}^{\infty}_{M,V} := \sup_k \mathsf{Prob}^k_{M,V}$ holds

$$[\![M]\!] \geq \sum_{V} \mathsf{Prob}^{\infty}_{M,V} [\![V]\!].$$

Finally, the following logical relation will be used to provide the key lemma of the adequacy theorem.

Definition 5.5. Consider the following family of locally continuous functors $1 \to \mathbf{KS}$:

$$[\![\sigma]\!]^{(0)} = [\![\mu X.X]\!] = 0 \qquad [\![\mu X.\tau]\!]^{(n+1)} = [\![\tau[X \mapsto \mu^n X.\tau]]\!]^{(n)}$$
$$[\![\sigma \star \tau]\!]^{(n)} = [\![\sigma]\!]^{(n)} \star [\![\tau]\!]^{(n)} \qquad (\star \in \{\times, +, \Rightarrow\})$$

For every closed type σ, consider the relations $\lhd^n_{\sigma}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), between $[\![\sigma]\!]^{(n)}$ and the set of all closed terms of type σ, defined by induction on n and on σ as follows:

$$x \lhd^n_{\sigma+\tau} M \equiv \exists y.\exists z.\exists N.\exists P.\exists \kappa \in [0,1].\, y \lhd^n_{\sigma} N \wedge z \lhd^n_{\tau} P$$
$$\wedge\, x \leq \mathsf{Prob}_{M,\mathsf{inl}(N)} \cdot (\amalg_1 \circ y) + \mathsf{Prob}_{M,\mathsf{inr}(P)} \cdot (\amalg_2 \circ z)$$

$$x \lhd^n_{\sigma\times\tau} M \equiv \pi_1 \circ x \lhd^n_{\sigma} \mathsf{fst}(M) \wedge \pi_2 \circ x \lhd^n_{\tau} \mathsf{snd}(M)$$

$$f \lhd^n_{\sigma\Rightarrow\tau} M \equiv \forall x.\forall \vdash P : \sigma.(x \lhd^n_{\sigma} P \implies f(x) \lhd^n_{\tau} (M)P)$$

$$x \lhd^{n+1}_{\mu X.\tau} \mathsf{intro}(M) \equiv x \lhd^n_{\tau[X\mapsto\mu X.\tau]} M$$

Then, for every type σ, consider the relation $\lhd_\sigma$ between the locally continuous functor $[\![\sigma]\!]$ and all closed terms of type $\vdash \sigma$, defined by $x \lhd_\sigma M \equiv \forall n. \psi^n_\sigma(x) \lhd^n_\sigma M$ with $\psi^n_\sigma : [\![\sigma]\!] \to [\![\sigma]\!]^{(n)}$ inductively defined by:

$$\psi^0_\sigma = ! : [\![\sigma]\!] \to 0 \qquad \psi^n_{\sigma\star\tau} = \psi^n_\sigma \star \psi^n_\tau \qquad \psi^{n+1}_{\mu X.\tau} = \psi^n_{\tau[X\mapsto\mu X.\tau]} \qquad (\star \in \{\times, +, \Rightarrow\})$$

Our denotational model is a domain-theoretical model of FPC [8, Ex. 8.5.3], see Appendix A for the validation of Axiom 5. Therefore, the construction of the logical relation on recursive types $\mu X.\tau$ is given by Fiore's construction of solutions of recursive equation between relations [8, Def. 7.5]. The interested reader will find the details of this construction in [7, Ch. 9] and a simplified construction in [12, App. A].

The logical relation $\lhd_\tau$ has the following closure properties.

Proposition 5.6. If $\vdash M : \sigma$ and $M \to_d M'$, then $x \lhd_\sigma M$ holds if and only if $x \lhd_\sigma M'$ holds.

$$\mathsf{id} \lhd_1 \mathsf{unit} \text{ for } 1 \equiv 0 \Rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \mathsf{unit} = \lambda x^0.x, \text{ with } 0 \equiv \mu X.X$$

$$(x, y) \lhd_{\sigma\times\tau} (M, N) \iff (x \lhd_\sigma M \wedge y \lhd_\tau N)$$

$$x \lhd_{\mu X.\tau} \mathsf{intro}(M) \iff \textsc{elim}(x) \lhd_{\tau[X\mapsto\mu X.\tau]} M$$

$$\kappa \cdot (\Pi_1 \circ x) + (1-\kappa) \cdot (\Pi_2 \circ y) \lhd_{\sigma+\tau} \mathsf{inl}(M) \oplus_\kappa \mathsf{inr}(N) \iff x \lhd_\sigma M \wedge y \lhd_\tau N \, (k \in [0,1])$$

$$\Pi_1 \circ x \lhd_{\sigma+\tau} \mathsf{inl}(M) \iff x \lhd_\sigma M \qquad \Pi_2 \circ x \lhd_{\sigma+\tau} \mathsf{inr}(M) \iff x \lhd_\tau M$$

Considering the definition and the closure properties of the logical relation, the following adequacy lemma is obtained by structural induction on the structure of terms.

Lemma 5.7. Consider a judgment $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ with $\Gamma \equiv (x_1 : \sigma_1, \cdots, x_n : \sigma_n)$, where every type σ_i is closed. Moreover, consider a family $P = \{P_i\}_{1\le i\le n}$ of closed terms of type $\{\sigma_i\}_{1\le i\le n}$ (i.e. $\vdash P_i : \sigma_i$) and a family $x = \{x_i\}_{1\le i\le n}$ of variables of type $\sigma = \{\sigma_i\}_{1\le i\le n}$ such that $[\![\Gamma \vdash x_i : \sigma_i]\!] \lhd_{\sigma_i} P_i$. Then, $[\![\Gamma \vdash M : \tau]\!] \lhd_\tau M[x \mapsto P]$.

Outline of proof. Here, we will reason as usual by induction on terms.

Case $M = x_i$: the relation $[\![\Gamma \vdash x_i : \sigma_i]\!](\rho) \lhd_{\sigma_i} P_i = x_i[x \mapsto P]$ holds.

Case $M = \mathsf{inl}_{\sigma,\tau}(N)$ and case $M = \mathsf{inr}_{\sigma,\tau}(N)$: Follows from the closure property of the sum, see Proposition 5.6

Case $M = \mathsf{case}(N)$ of $\mathsf{inl}(x).P$ or $\mathsf{inr}(y).Q$: Follows from the two sub-cases $N = \mathsf{inl}(L)$ and $N = \mathsf{inr}(L)$ (see [7, Lem. 9.2.18]).

Case $M = (N, P)$: By Proposition 5.6.

Case $M = \mathsf{fst}(N)$, $M = \mathsf{snd}(N)$: By Definition 5.5.

Case $M = \mathsf{intro}(N)$:

$$[\![\mathsf{intro}(N)]\!] = \textsc{intro}([\![M]\!]) \lhd_{\mu X.\tau} \mathsf{intro}(N) \iff \textsc{elim}(\textsc{intro}([\![N]\!])) = [\![N]\!] \lhd_{\tau[X\mapsto\mu X.\tau]} N$$

Case $M = \mathsf{elim}(N)$: By Definition 5.5 and Proposition 5.6.

Case $M = \lambda y^{\sigma}.N : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$: Given any element $y \in [\![\sigma]\!]$ and any closed term Q of type σ such that $y \lhd_{\sigma} Q$, we have that the relation

$$[\![\Gamma \vdash \lambda y.N]\!](\rho) = [\![\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash N]\!](\rho, x) \lhd_{\tau} N[x \mapsto P, y \mapsto Q]$$

holds by induction hypothesis. Then the relation

$$[\![\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.N]\!](\rho)(y) \lhd_{\tau} (\lambda y^{\sigma}.N[x \mapsto P])Q$$

holds by the closure property of the logical relation for the following deterministic reduction:

$$(\lambda y^{\sigma}.N[x \mapsto P])Q \to_d N[x \mapsto P, y \mapsto Q]$$

Case $M = (N)L$: straightforward induction, based on the definition of the logical relation $\lhd_{\sigma \Rightarrow \tau}$ on the type $\sigma \Rightarrow \tau$.

Case $M = N \oplus_{\kappa} L$: If M is of type 1 then $N = L = \mathsf{unit}$ and therefore M reduces to unit with probability 1. Then $\mathsf{id} \lhd_1 M$ by the closure property of the deterministic reduction rules, see Proposition 5.6.
When M is of type $\sigma + \tau$, the adequacy lemma holds by the closure property of the sum.
When M is of type $\sigma \times \tau$ or $\sigma \Rightarrow \tau$, one can reason about the term

$$\mathsf{case}(\mathsf{inl}(x) \oplus_{\kappa} \mathsf{inr}(y)) \text{ of } \mathsf{inl}(x).N \text{ or } \mathsf{inr}(y).L$$

which is axiomatically equivalent to $N \oplus_{\kappa} L$. □

Finally, one can enounce the following adequacy theorem for all types.

Theorem 5.8. For every closed term $\vdash M : \tau$,

$$[\![M]\!] = \sum_{V \in \Sigma} \mathsf{Prob}^{\infty}_{M,V} \cdot [\![V]\!]$$

Concluding remarks

In the present paper, it was shown that dcpos, when associated with a compatible convex structure, form a computationally adequate model for a probabilistic extension of Call-by-Name FPC. While this study originated from a deep interest for the semantics of quantum computation [20, 21, 23], it can be seen as the natural programming language theoretic approach to Keimel & Plotkin's work on probabilistic non-determinism [14].

By using an arguably simpler model than probabilistic coherence spaces, one can introduce recursive types with a clear interpretation which has yet to be understood for probabilistic coherence spaces. On that matter, the precise connection with those linear logic-inspired structures has yet to be understood.

On a similar note, it seems worth investigating whether our programming language relates to Dana Scott's stochastic lambda-calculus [22], which involves a model of Call-by-Name probability, later used to model Call-by-Value probability, via a continuation-passing style translation.

For an extension of Call-by-Value FPC with probabilistic choice, the interested reader shall have a look at the Chapter 8 of [12], which provides a denotational semantics where the convex structure is free, i.e. comes from a monad, and is therefore less complex than the convex structure which is considered in this paper. Moreover, while there are ways to translate from Call-by-Name to Call-by-Value [17,24] (if one ignores sums), the preservation of the eta-law of functions and the preservation of adequacy aren't guaranteed by such mathematical operations. The novelty of our approach for the adequacy proof partially relies on a more subtle consideration of the interpretation of sums, in order to fit to the probabilistic case of the Call-by-Name paradigm: for example, the definition of the logical relation on sum types in my language is more sophisticated than the one chosen by Jones.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Bart Jacobs, Robin Kaarsgaard, Ohad Kammar, Klaus Keimel and Michele Pagani for helpful discussions, and Sam Staton for suggesting to me the problem and guiding me through the elaboration of this paper. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n. 320571. My visits to the Department of Computer Science of Oxford University have been financially supported by a Royal Society University Research Fellowship.

References

[1] Samson Abramsky and Achim Jung. Domain theory. 1994.
[2] Michael Barr. Algebraically compact functors. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 82(3):211–231, 1992.
[3] Vincent Danos and Thomas Ehrhard. Probabilistic coherence spaces as a model of higher-order probabilistic computation. *Information and Computation*, 209(6):966–991, 2011.
[4] Thomas Ehrhard. A Call-By-Push-Value FPC and its interpretation in Linear Logic. 2015.
[5] Thomas Ehrhard, Michele Pagani, and Christine Tasson. The Computational Meaning of Probabilistic Coherence Spaces. In *Logic in Computer Science (LICS), 2011 26th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 87–96, June 2011.
[6] Thomas Ehrhard, Christine Tasson, and Michele Pagani. Probabilistic coherence spaces are fully abstract for probabilistic PCF. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, volume 49(1), pages 309–320. ACM, 2014.
[7] Marcelo Fiore. *Axiomatic Domain Theory in Categories of Partial Maps*. PhD thesis, 1994.
[8] Marcelo P Fiore and Gordon D Plotkin. An axiomatisation of computationally adequate domain theoretic models of FPC. 1994.
[9] Jean-Yves Girard. Between Logic and Quantic: A Tract. In Thomas Ehrhard, editor, *Linear Logic in Computer Science*, pages 316–346. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
[10] I Hasuo, BPF Bart Jacobs, and A Ana Sokolova. Generic trace semantics via coinduction. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3(4):11, 2007.
[11] Bart Jacobs. *Introduction to Coalgebra. Towards Mathematics of States and Observations*. 2012.
[12] Claire Jones. *Probabilistic non-determinism*. PhD thesis, 1990.
[13] Claire Jones and Gordon D Plotkin. A probabilistic powerdomain of evaluations. In *Logic in Computer Science, 1989. LICS'89, Proceedings., Fourth Annual Symposium on*, pages 186–195. IEEE, 1989.
[14] Klaus Keimel and Gordon D Plotkin. Mixed powerdomains for probability and nondeterminism. 2015.
[15] Paul Blain Levy. *Call-by-push-value: A Functional/imperative Synthesis*, volume 2. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
[16] Guy McCusker. Games and full abstraction for FPC. In *Logic in Computer Science, 1996. LICS'96. Proceedings., Eleventh Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 174–183. IEEE, 1996.
[17] Eugenio Moggi. Notions of computation and monads. *Information and computation*, 93(1):55–92, 1991.
[18] Praveen Narayanan, Jacques Carette, Wren Romano, Chung-chieh Shan, and Robert Zinkov. Probabilistic inference by program transformation in Hakaru (system description).

[19] Michele Pagani, Peter Selinger, and Benoit Valiron. Applying quantitative semantics to higher-order quantum computing. volume 49, pages 647–658. ACM, 2014.
[20] Mathys Rennela. Towards a Quantum Domain Theory: Order-enrichment and Fixpoints in W*-algebras. volume 308, pages 289 – 307, 2014. Proceedings of the 30th Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS XXX).
[21] Mathys Rennela and Sam Staton. Complete positivity and natural representation of quantum computations. volume 319, pages 369–385, 2015. Proceedings of the 31st Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS XXXI).
[22] Dana S Scott. Stochastic λ-calculi. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 12(3):369–376, 2014.
[23] Sam Staton. Algebraic Effects, Linearity, and Quantum Programming Languages. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 395–406. ACM, 2015.
[24] Philip Wadler. Comprehending monads. *Mathematical structures in computer science*, 2(04):461–493, 1992.

Appendix A. Algebraic compactness of the category of Kegelspitzen

In our denotational model, recursive types are interpreted as fixpoints of locally continuous endofunctors. The existence of such fixpoints is guaranteed by a property called algebraic compactness [2].

A category $\mathbf{C}$ is algebraically compact for a class $\mathcal{L}$ of endofunctors on $\mathbf{C}$ if every endofunctor F in the class $\mathcal{L}$ has a canonical fixpoint, which is the initial F-algebra, or equivalently the inverse of the final F-coalgebra.

An endofunctor F on a $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-enriched category $\mathbf{C}$ is locally continuous (resp. locally monotone) if $F_{X,Y} : \mathbf{C}(X,Y) \to \mathbf{C}(FX,FY)$ is Scott-continuous (resp. monotone). To obtain the algebraic compactness of $\mathbf{dConv}_{\leq 1}$ for locally continuous endofunctors, we rely on the following result [8, Example 6.9].

Theorem A.1. For every small $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-category $\mathcal{W}$, the $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-functor-category of functors $\mathcal{W} \to \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$ and natural transformations between them (ordered pointwise) is algebraically compact for the class of locally continuous endofunctors.

Observe that the Lawvere theory $\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}$ is a small $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-category: for every pair (n,m) of natural numbers, the homset $\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}(n,m) = \mathcal{D}^{\infty}_{\leq 1}(n)^m$ is a dcpo as a finite product of dcpo. Indeed, $\mathcal{D}^{\infty}_{\leq 1}(X)$ is known to be a dcpo when equipped with the pointwise order [10]:

$$\varphi \leq \psi \iff \forall x.\varphi(x) \leq \psi(x)$$

Then, the functor category $[\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}, \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}]$ is algebraically compact for locally continuous endofunctors. Now, with the same method, for every locally continuous endofunctor F on $[\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}, \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}]_{\times}$, the chain of embeddings $(D_n, \alpha_n : D_n \to D_{n+1})_n$ is such that D_n is product-preserving for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and therefore the fixpoint D of the locally continuous endofunctor F is also product-preserving. We conclude that the category $\mathbf{KS}$, which is equivalent to the category $[\mathbb{L}_{\leq 1}, \mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}]_{\times}$ is algebraically compact for locally continuous endofunctors. That is to say, every locally continuous endofunctor F on the category $\mathbf{KS}$ admits a canonical fixpoint μF and there is an isomorphism between the initial F-algebra and the inverse of the final F-coalgebra.

Let us be more specific. An embedding-projection pair is a pair of arrows $\langle e, p\rangle \in \mathbf{C}(X,Y) \times \mathbf{C}(Y,X)$ in a $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-enriched category $\mathbf{C}$ such that $p \circ e = \mathrm{id}_X$ and $e \circ p \leq \mathrm{id}_Y$.

For two pairs $\langle e_1, p_1\rangle$, $\langle e_2, p_2\rangle$, it can be shown that $e_1 \leq e_2$ iff $p_2 \leq p_1$, which means that one component of the pair can uniquely determine the other one. We denote by e^P the projection corresponding to a given embedding e and p^E the embedding corresponding to a given projection p. It should be noted that $(e \circ f)^P = f^P \circ e^P$, $(p \circ q)^E = q^E \circ p^E$ and $\mathrm{id}^P = \mathrm{id}^E = \mathrm{id}$.

The category $\mathbf{C}^E$ of embeddings of a $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-enriched category $\mathbf{C}$ is the subcategory of $\mathbf{C}$ that has objects of $\mathbf{C}$ has objects and embeddings as arrows. It should be noted that this category is itself a $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-enriched category. Dually, one can define the category $\mathbf{C}^P = (\mathbf{C}^E)^{op}$ of projections of a $\mathbf{Dcpo}_{\perp!}$-enriched category $\mathbf{C}$.

We can now consider the following setting. Let $F : \mathbf{KS} \to \mathbf{KS}$ be a locally continuous endofunctor. Consider the ω-chain $\Delta = (D_n, \alpha_n)_n$ for which $D_0 = \mathbf{0}$, the embedding $\alpha_0 : D_0 \to FD_0$ is the unique Scott-continuous affine map from D_0 to FD_0, and the equalities $\alpha_{n+1} = F\alpha_n$ and $D_{n+1} = FD_n$ hold for every $n \geq 0$.

Since the endofunctor F is locally monotone, if for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an embedding-projection pair $\langle \alpha_n^E, \alpha_n^P\rangle$, the pair $\langle \alpha_{n+1}^E, \alpha_{n+1}^P\rangle = \langle F\alpha_n^E, F\alpha_n^P\rangle$ is also an embedding-projection pair. It follows that the ω-chain Δ is well-defined.

Then, the Kegelspitze $D = \{(x_n)_n \in \Pi_n D_n \mid \forall n \geq 0, \alpha_n^p(x_{n+1}) = x_n\}$, ordered componentwise, is the canonical fixpoint given by the algebraic compactness of $\mathbf{KS}$ and is denoted by μF in this paper. A direct consequence of this observation is that $[\![\Theta \vdash \mu X.\tau]\!]_e = \mu[\![\Theta, X \vdash \tau]\!]_e$ $(e \in |\mathbf{KS}|^n)$ is a Kegelspitzen for every recursive type $\mu X.\tau$. Then, the computational behaviour of the denotations of types is guaranteed to be well-behaved, since every type judgement is associated to a locally continuous functor.